

(b) (6)

12/10/2007 12:22 PM To

(b) (6), Jose Torres/R6/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

bcc

Subject

Message of 12/08/07

Mr. Torres:

Thank you for your time regarding our concern. If you will review Texcom's latest letter to shareholders, you will note the information I forwarded to Mr. (b) (6). The copy that you have in MS format is an older letter to shareholders. The one I sent you is the newest one, currently on Texcom's website.

I understand that the EPA's hands are tied regarding this issue, because of the hazardous/non-hazardous designation of an injection well.

However,

I think it is important for the EPA to note that TexCom failed to performed the referenced compatibility tests, because as they stated, they

did not know what fluids to test. How then, can we be sure the well will be used for only non-hazardous waste?

Secondly, and more importantly, while it may be the TCEQ's job to ensure that all state and federal laws are enforced, in light of the Texas law, which I happened to find by chance, that is not being enforced, I think it

is prudent for us all to ask: What other laws are not being enforced?

We

need the EPA's help in answering this question at the federal level.

Mr. Torres, I have attached a copy of the aquifer through which these wells will be drilled. You can find this map and others at www.twdb.state.tx.us I also have real science that indicates the surrounding abandoned wells will fail, which I will share with you after the hearings. (This will be a part of testimony during the hearings.) I can tell you now, for example, there is one well, not on Texcom's application where the bottom of the old well is less than 350 feet from the injection well (well within the plume), not 800 feet as stated in Texcom's application. This well is in the records, and is easily researched, by even a layperson. Why isn't it in Texcom's application, and more importantly, why didn't the TCEQ find this information?

After a review of the attached aquifer, you should realize, this has the potential of being the largest man-made environmental disaster in U.S. history. It is obvious after even the most superficial review, that the TCEQ needs oversight. They have failed appropriate review of documented facts, done a cursory evaluation of the site and ground water impact and

have not enforced Texas law. It is time for the federal agencies to step in.

Sincerely

(b) (6)

> From: (b) (6)
> Subject: FW: Your Message of 12/08/07
> Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 11:23:12 -0600
>
> Hi (b) (6),
>
> I received the following message from Mr. Torres
>
> (b) (6)
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Torres.Jose@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Torres.Jose@epamail.epa.gov]
> Sent: Monday, December 10, 2007 10:29 AM
> To: (b) (6)
> Subject: Re: Your Message of 12/08/07
>
>
> Good morning Mr. (b) (6):
>
> Thank you very much for your e-mail message of Saturday, December 08,
> 2007, and for the information on the latest developments related to the
> CROW citizens group's activities in connection with the application
> from
> TexCom. I will be sharing this information with my managers. In the
> meantime, I look forward to hearing from Ms. (b) (6). I have attached
> an MS Word copy of TexCom's letter, for your convenience. I found it
> easier to read. Please feel free to call or e-mail me if you have
> questions. Have a nice day. Sincerely,
>
> Jose Eduardo Torres - 6WQ-SG
> Ground Water/UIC Section
> EPA, Region 6
> (214) 665-8092
>
>
> (See attached file: 071208(b) (6) OnTexCom.doc)

Share life as it happens with the new Windows Live. Share now!